

Attorney Docket No. SOM919990018US1

REMARKS

The present application was filed on May 31, 2001 with claims 1-34. Claims 1-34 remain pending and claims 1, 11, 16, 23 and 30 have been amended and are the pending independent claims

In the outstanding final Office Action dated April 20, 2005, the Examiner: (i) rejected claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7-10, 16, 17, 19, 20, 23, 24, 26 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,108,687 to Craig (hereinafter "Craig"); and (ii) rejected claims 3, 6, 11-15, 18, 21, 22, 25 and 28-34 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Craig in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,173,317 to Chaddha et al. (hereinafter "Chaddha").

With respect to the rejection of claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7-10, 16, 17, 19, 20, 23, 24, 26 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Craig, Applicants assert that Craig fails to disclose the limitations of independent claims 1, 16 and 23, as amended. Independent claims 1, 16 and 23 have been amended to recite that each web page of the series of web pages is transmitted individually upon reception of a request at the server from the leader user client computer. Additionally, independent claims 1, 16 and 23 have been amended to recite that the individual transmission of the series of web pages prohibits the one or more audience user client computers from obtaining, via audience request, a web page for future display in the presentation. Support for the amendment can be found in FIGS. 7 and 8 and pages 17-20.

While Craig discloses that a student workstation may depart from a synchronized lecture, Craig also states in column 4, lines 33-34 that "the instructor and student applets directly download said document at the beginning of a presentation," where the document includes a list of URLs that define the totality of the presentation. Further, Craig states in column 9, lines 11-13 that "[a]fter the user selects a lecture, the applet downloads it and directs the browser to retrieve and display the first 'slide' in the lecture." Thus, Craig discloses a system in which a list of URLs relating to slides included in a lecture are downloaded to every user computer before the lecture begins, allowing a user to follow a synchronized lecture or proceed through the slides in any way that is desired. This differs significantly from the invention described in independent claims 1, 16 and 23, which recites a techniques that provide individual slides of a presentation to the user client computers upon receipt

Attorney Docket No. SOM919990018US1


of a request from the leader user client computer, preventing an audience user client computer from accessing web pages for future display in the presentation.

Dependent claims 2, 4, 5, 7-10, 17, 19, 20, 24, 26 and 27 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency from independent claims 1, 16 and 23, and also recite patentable subject matter in their own right. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection to claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7-10, 16, 17, 19, 20, 23, 24, 26 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) is therefore respectfully requested.

With respect to the rejection of claims 3, 6, 11-15, 18, 21, 22, 25 and 28-34 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Craig in view of Chaddha, Applicants assert that the combination of Craig and Chaddha fails to disclose the limitations of independent claims 11 and 30. Independent claims 11 and 30 have been amended in the same manner described above with regard to claims 1, 16 and 23. The combination of Craig and Chaddha fails to disclose that slides of a presentation are provided individually during the presentation, preventing an audience user client computer from accessing web pages for future display in the presentation. Dependent claims 3, 6, 12-15, 18, 21, 22, 25, 28, 29 and 31-34 are patentable at least by virtue of the dependency from independent claims 1, 11, 16, 23 and 30, and also recite patentable subject matter in their own right. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection to claims 3, 6, 11-15, 18, 21, 22, 25 and 28-34 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is therefore respectfully requested.

In view of the above, Applicants believe that claims 1-34 are in condition for allowance, and respectfully request withdrawal of the §102(e) and §103(a) rejections.

Respectfully submitted,



Robert W. Griffith
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 48,956
Ryan, Mason & Lewis, LLP
90 Forest Avenue
Locust Valley, NY 11560
(516) 759-4547

Date: June 20, 2005